

MAR 4 1963

Pers 2 Richard N. GARDNER

1963

Approved For Release 2000/08/27 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000300030006-3

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

x 29 6  
Dec 6 Cuba A1131

## AN ANSWER FROM ABROAD

One of the more fashionable ideas around Washington of late has been the doctrine that the tremendous postwar recovery of Europe has been due to the comparatively large deficit-financing of nations like France and West Germany.

The popularity of this doctrine is understandable. It would provide a nice rationalization for the still bigger U.S. Government deficits which, from the looks of things, we are going to get anyway. What better retort to stubborn objectors than to be able to say, See what wonderful things big deficits did for the prosperity of Europe?

Well, the doctrine is neither factually accurate nor logically persuasive, but because of the differences between U.S. and European bookkeeping its advocates have been able to muddy up the waters. So it's useful now to have one of the leading bankers of West Germany inject some refreshing clarity into the discussion.

Speaking for his own country, Dr. Hermann Abs, managing director of Frankfurt's Deutsche Bank, told the American Bankers Association convention that for the past decade "neither the Federal nor the state budgets were in deficit positions—whatever accounting methods one might apply. On the contrary, there were often surpluses instead, and yet Germany had one of the most outstanding rates of economic growth within Europe between the years 1959 and 1960."

So much for the alleged fact that the Germans did all they did by virtue of virtuous deficits. To what, then, can one attribute West Germany's phenomenal growth record?

Dr. Abs is no simple-minded man in search of a single answer. He notes many contributing factors, from the U.S. aid extended to West Germany after the war to the restraint exercised by trade unions (refreshing thought there, too) in their demands for higher wages unrelated to productivity. He gives credit, too, to government planning and assistance.

But it was government planning with a difference. A decade ago the German Government granted special depreciation allowances to basic industries for investment purposes. Special tax measures were adopted for industrial concerns, including a substantial reduction in corporation taxes on distributed profits.

Meanwhile, says Dr. Abs, "the credit policy of the Central Bank in those years was extremely conservative and restricted." And he adds that "if there had been deficit spending in Germany at that time, most likely excessive price increases, on all fronts like those in the subsidized building or housing sector, would not have been avoidable."

If this correlation of a "conservative and restricted" money policy with rapid economic growth seems shocking to the President's Council of Economic Advisers, they must be even more stunned by Dr. Abs' account of what happened when Germany did briefly flirt with more liberal policies.

By 1960 Germany had gotten so prosperous it was embarrassing and had brought on the problem of a surplus in its balance of payments. So the Government lowered interest rates, revalued the mark and "instead of slowing down Government spending" increased it to a peak—partly, Dr. Abs suggests, to help the government win an election, a thing not unheard of in this country.

All this was a "fundamental mistake" and the result was a slowdown in the growth rate, a decline in the profit margins of industry with a consequent drop in new investments and new difficulties for German industries in foreign trade.

Dr. Abs said his knowledge was "too limited" to inject himself into the U.S. argument about the virtues of deficit financing. But for Americans less inhibited about their conclusions from the German experience,

he did offer the lesson of his own country. "Deficit spending," he said, "if applied during the period of 1950 to 1960, would have prevented the German economy to grow as it did grow."

We hope the Council of Economic Advisers was listening.

**"The United Nations in Crisis: Cuba and the Congo"—An Address by Richard N. Gardner, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, Before the 1963 Mid-Atlantic Model General Assembly, Washington, D.C., February 23, 1963**

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of an address by Richard N. Gardner, the able Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, which was delivered before the Mid-Atlantic Model General Assembly held at Washington, D.C., on February 23, 1963.

The text of Mr. Gardner's address follows:

**THE UNITED NATIONS IN CRISIS: CUBA AND THE CONGO**

I don't know which group causes us the most trouble in Washington these days—the uncritical admirers of the United Nations or the uncritical opponents of the United Nations.

When I say uncritical admirers of the United Nations, I mean those people who are always writing us to say: "Naughty boys—you have bypassed the U.N." They want the United Nations to do everything.

These people remind me of the tribal chief who came to the General Assembly some years ago to complain that the British were oppressing him because they would not let him keep his 100 wives. One veteran U.N. delegate rose in his full dignity and said: "This is not a fit subject for the United Nations. Let this man keep his 100 wives—and let the ravages of nature teach him the error of his ways."

The uncritical opponents of the United Nations are those who are never satisfied no matter what the U.N. does. I have in mind one critic who wrote me 3 months ago to say that the United Nations was a failure because it was too weak to deal with Tshombe. Now he is writing to complain that the U.N. is too strong and has become a "superstate."

Like the uncritical admirers, the uncritical opponents of the U.N. feel under no obligation to base their opinions on facts. As Stephen Leacock said: "It's not what people don't know that causes all the trouble, it's what they do know that ain't so."

We in Washington try to steer a course between these two extremes. We look upon the United Nations in a hard and practical way as a means of promoting our national self-interest. This statement should not shock anyone, because this is the way that other countries look upon the United Nations—as

a means of promoting their own national self-interest.

The United Nations is not a substitute for national interest, but rather a place where nations work together to promote their national interests on those matters where they cannot get adequate results by acting alone.

These general observations are familiar to you. Let us test them in two of the great crises of the last year: Cuba and the Congo.

## THE CUBAN CRISIS

The Cuban crisis was a particularly eloquent illustration of the U.N.'s threefold value to the United States as a place for debate, negotiation, and action—once the power and determination of the United States and its allies had been demonstrated in the quarantine.

As a place for debate, the United Nations enabled us to build support for our Cuban policy in the most dramatic and effective way. You will all remember what Mr. Zorin said before millions on TV—that the Soviets had no need to put missiles into Cuba and that the U.S. evidence of the missile sites was manufactured by the CIA. We countered by showing pictures of the missile sites in the Security Council. Shortly thereafter Khrushchev admitted the presence of the missiles and agreed to withdraw them.

This public exposure of Soviet duplicity had a tremendous impact in building support for the quarantine and other aspects of our Cuban policy. Even though the Cuban matter was considered in the Security Council, it affected the course of the General Assembly and turned the general opinion of mankind in our favor on a number of other subjects. We could not have achieved this result with anything like such success if we had been obliged to show our pictures and tell our story separately in 109 different countries.

As a place for negotiation, the United Nations was scarcely less important to us. The Secretary-General served as a useful go-between in negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union.

To begin with he helped avoid an armed clash at sea between the Soviets and ourselves when he proposed that Soviet ships stay clear of our quarantine fleet. If the Soviets needed an out, they could find it in responding to a U.N. appeal, and not admitting publicly they were responding to U.S. power.

As a place for action, the United Nations demonstrated its potential for the future. Khrushchev agreed to U.N. inspection on the spot. He could never have agreed to U.S. inspection. Then Castro refused and branded Communist Cuba as unwilling to cooperate with the world peace organization.

The fact that the United Nations was willing and able to perform the inspection role in Cuba and that this was agreed to between the United States and the Soviet Union had a twofold value: the United Nations demonstrated a potential of considerable importance for the future, and Castro was put in the position of defying not just U.S. inspection but U.N. inspection, thereby leaving inspection to our own resources.

## THE CONGO CRISIS

Let us turn now from Cuba to the Congo. Some people still ask: What is the United Nations doing in the Congo and why is the United States supporting it?

To answer this question it is useful to recall the choice that confronted the United States in the Congo in the summer of 1960. The alternatives open to the United States were clear.

We could do nothing—in which case the Congo would wallow in chaos and bloodshed and the Soviet bloc would be free to move in to pick up the remains.

We could intervene directly—and trigger a confrontation in the heart of Africa of the great powers—a confrontation which could lead to another "Spanish civil war" and be the prelude to a wider conflict.

Or we could do what we in fact did—give assistance to the Congo through the United Nations.

I think the judgment of history will be that the use of the United Nations in the Congo was the least dangerous of the three dangerous alternatives confronting the United States and the world at large in the summer of 1960.

Most Americans recognize the merit of these arguments. Yet a number of specific questions about the Congo are still raised.

#### LEGALITY OF U.N. ACTION IN CONGO

Some people ask: Was the United Nations action in the Congo legal? The answer is yes, for three reasons:

First, the Government of the Congo asked for the United Nations to come in.

Second, the Security Council authorized the U.N. to go in with a mandate to maintain law and order—a mandate which was subsequently expanded into a mandate to prevent civil war, protect the Congo's territorial integrity, and remove the foreign mercenaries.

Third, the military actions of the U.N. force were taken in pursuit of these mandates and in self-defense.

It is well to remember that the recent fighting which culminated in the end of the secession of Katanga began on Christmas eve when drunken Katangese soldiers attacked a U.N. command post. This was the culmination of a long series of harassments of the U.N. soldiers designed to cut them off from one another and from their supplies and communications.

I think it is a generally accepted principle of both domestic and international law that a cop who is lawfully on the beat has a right to defend himself against attack.

As a part of this legal question, there are people who ask: Isn't this intervention in the internal affairs of the Congo? The answer is no again, for at least two reasons:

First, the Congo asked for the U.N. to come in.

Second, this was not an internal matter—there was a clear threat to international peace and security because of the actual or potential involvement of outside powers.

Still other people ask: Doesn't this violate traditional United States support for the principle of self-determination? The answer is no, for at least three reasons:

First, there is no absolute principle of self-determination. We fought a civil war to deny it. We have recognized both at home and abroad the dangers of Balkinization. Suppose the mayor of a Texas town which happened to have most of the oil in Texas decided to secede from the State and take the oil with him. I don't suppose that would be permitted by the people of Texas or by the people of the United States. The application of the principle of self-determination in the Congo without any qualification would mean the creation of some 20 tribal states and the disintegration of the whole into disorder and chaos.

Second, even according to the standards of self-determination, Tshombe could not pretend to speak for the Katanga. As you know, he was the leader of the Lunda tribe, one of several tribes in Katanga. The Lundas are a minority in numbers and occupy less than half of the land area of Katanga. Tshombe is strongly opposed by the Baluba tribe in the north. In the only popular election in Katanga, his party gained only 25 seats in a 60-seat assembly. The parliamentary group which supported him during the last 2 years was a rump parliament lacking full Baluba representation. We may also note that the United Nations forces were

greeted with open arms when they entered Jadotville and Kolwezi in the heart of Tshombe's tribal area.

Third, Tshombe was estopped from pleading the principle of self-determination when he agreed to accept a single Congolese state. He did this at the Brussels roundtable conference of January 1960, before the Belgians left. He has done it on numerous occasions since. He did it as recently as last fall when he accepted the conciliation plan of the United Nations.

#### THE CONGO AND MISSISSIPPI

There are people who will concede all these things but say: "Very well, but where will this United Nations business stop? Isn't the Congo a precedent for the U.N. going into Mississippi?"

The answer is "No" again, for three reasons:

First, we would not ask the United Nations to come into Mississippi.

Second, if others insisted on bringing the U.N. into Mississippi, we could prevent this from getting the necessary votes.

Third, by no stretch of the imagination can the situation in Mississippi be regarded as a threat to international peace and security.

Finally, there are those who are satisfied on these legal and moral questions, but ask: "Wouldn't our national interest have been served better by supporting Tshombe?"

The answer is "No" because—

The central government under Adoula is moderate and pro-Western.

Tshombe supporters have been working with the leftists to destroy the central government.

Tshombe had no support in black Africa and very little anywhere else. No country has ever recognized Katanga separatism.

The secession of Katanga under Tshombe would have ended moderate government in the Congo and would have precipitated the disintegration of the country into tribal groupings with maximum opportunity for the Communists to come in.

In short, the efforts of Tshombe to set up a separate regime in Katanga played into the hands of communism.

Now the military phase of the U.N. operation in the Congo has passed. The phase of nation building has begun. A U.S. mission to the Congo under Harlan Cleveland, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, has just returned with proposals for the economic reconstruction of the Congo under U.N. auspices. In the economic tasks ahead for the Congo the United Nations can play a role which no single nation could play alone without compromising Congolese independence and making the Congo a subject of cold war controversy.

#### U.N. SPECIAL FUND AND CUBA

The moral of this story is not that the United Nations is perfect. Indeed, there are a number of things that are done at the U.N. with which we do not agree. During the last 2 weeks we have had a dramatic illustration of this in the decision of the U.N. Special Fund to proceed—albeit on a tentative basis—with an agricultural research project in Cuba.

This project was approved by the Governing Council of the Special Fund in May 1961. It calls for an allocation of \$1,157,000 from the Special Fund to assist in the expansion of an agricultural experimental station in Santiago de la Vegas.

The U.S. Government did everything consistent with the U.N. Charter to oppose this project. We oppose any source of aid and comfort to the Castro regime. We argued that special fund assistance to Cuba at this time could not be justified under the economic and technical criteria of the Special Fund's charter, in view of the chaos in Cuban agriculture which has resulted from the application of Communist tech-

niques and the subordination of the economic and social welfare of the Cuban people to the narrow political aims of the Castro regime.

Our arguments, I am sorry to say, did not receive the necessary support in the Governing Council. Mr. Paul Hoffman, the Managing Director of the Fund, concluded that he had no choice but to proceed with the project on a tentative basis. In the next few months he will send several experts to determine whether or not conditions in Cuba will permit the project to proceed and it is possible that the actual operation of the project will not go forward when representatives of the Fund have the opportunity to take an up-to-date reading of conditions on the spot.

The Special Fund project in Cuba is an example of a U.N. action with which we do not agree. But it is well in these matters to keep our eyes on the big picture. The Special Fund, like all U.N. economic agencies, is prohibited by its charter from making decisions on political grounds. The failure of other U.N. members to support us in our opposition to the Cuban project came not out of any solicitude for Cuba but out of the fear that stopping this project would jeopardize other projects to which the Soviet Union and other countries have objected. The special fund has 11 projects totaling \$7.5 million in Korea, Vietnam, and free China which the Soviets do not like—and which are being carried out today despite their misgiving.

The fact is that the U.N. Special Fund has been a great asset to the free world through its efforts to promote the material basis for free institutions. Even on the narrowest of political calculations the free world has got more out of the Special Fund than it has put in, while the reverse is true of the Communist bloc.

The bloc countries have contributed some \$7 million to the Special Fund; with this project in Cuba added to two previous projects in Poland they will have received \$3 million in return. If you add Yugoslavia, Communist contributions add up to \$8 million, projects in Communist countries to \$6 million. Out of the 288 Special Fund projects so far authorized, 282 have been in non-Communist countries. In financial terms, some \$248 million of the grand total of \$254 million of Fund projects—over 97 percent—go to the non-Communist world.

It would be tragic if our dissatisfaction with the project in Cuba were to destroy our support for the Special Fund. It would be the height of folly to sacrifice the 97 percent of its work we do like for the 3 percent we do not like. We do not bench a baseball player who is batting .970, nor fire a football coach because he loses one game in thirty.

The price of participating in any political institution is that you cannot get your way all of the time. We cannot expect to get our way all of the time in the United Nations. There will be entries on the debit as well as on the credit side of the ledger. The central question is whether the credits exceed the debits—whether looking at the balance sheet as a whole the institution is making a net contribution to our national interest. The U.S. Government continues to believe that the answer to that question is overwhelmingly in the affirmative.

#### TO STRENGTHEN THE UNITED NATIONS

Let me stress once again, however, that we are not entirely satisfied with the United Nations. We want to make it better.

In specific terms, we want to—

Strengthen the independence of the Secretariat against the attacks of the Soviet Union who have never accepted article 100 in principle or in practice.

Improve the method of financing peace-keeping operations and make defaulting members pay up.

1963

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A1133

Increase the efficiency of the U.N.'s economic and social work, particularly through more effective coordination of the specialized agencies.

Strengthen the U.N.'s capacity to settle future disputes—first, through preventive diplomacy to keep disputes from erupting into violence and, second, through peace-keeping actions to contain those disputes from widening into a global conflict.

In this last ambition, we must learn from the Congo experience to strengthen the U.N.'s future peacekeeping operations. We must improve the training, supply, financing, intelligence, public relations, and command and control of U.N. military operations.

We want to do these latter things not only for their own sake but as a means of promoting general and complete disarmament. For the fact is that nations will never be willing to eliminate or even radically reduce their arms until they have some substitute means of protecting their territorial integrity and defending their vital interest.

In an age when the Soviet Union and the United States have in their arsenals weapons each of which have the destructive power of all the bombs dropped in the Second World War, in an age when we face the prospect that no matter how many weapons one side might build neither side could escape unimaginable destruction in a nuclear holocaust—in such an age there is no rational alternative but to develop a civilized system of collective security under the aegis of the United Nations.

In Cuba, in the Congo, and elsewhere, the United Nations has acted—in the words of a distinguished commentator—not as a world superstate, but as a world public utility. If it did not exist, it would have to be invented.

### GOP Economy Drive

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. FRANK T. BOW**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, one of the first newspaper comments on the Republican appropriations committee task force to reduce the Federal budget is an excellent column by Peter Edson which I wish to include with my remarks.

As Mr. Edson points out, we hope to have the support of economy-minded Members from both sides of the aisle, for we hope that the citizens generally and the Members of Congress are not divided along partisan lines when they view with apprehension the constant increase in Government spending.

The Edson article follows:

#### GOP Economy Drive

(By Peter Edson)

Spearhead for the Republican drive to cut from \$10 to \$15 billion from President Kennedy's \$108 billion budget for next year is Representative FRANK T. Bow, of Canton, Ohio, and other GOP members of the House Appropriations Committee.

Representative Bow and his group will operate under Republican congressional leaders but they will seek support for their budget cutting from economy-minded Democrats. Republicans realize they can't succeed

in this operation without Democratic votes. But they played this coalition crisscross game in cutting Truman administration budgets in the 80th Congress and they think they can do it again.

If the Republicans and their Democratic kindred spirits can make major cuts in next year's budget, they believe it will help justify the tax cut both parties want. But the President's tax reform program is left out of the operation.

Maurice Stans, President Eisenhower's last Budget Bureau Director, has done the research job and compiled the figures which will be used as basis for the Republican-planned cuts. Mr. Stans will not take an active part in the operation but stay in the background as an adviser.

During the past month or so he has been commuting from his Los Angeles home to Washington while making an item-by-item and line-by-line analysis of the Kennedy budget.

Cutting the President's request for \$108 billion in new obligational authority by from \$10 to \$15 billion would mean an \$93 to \$98 billion new obligational authority. The resulting cut in spending for the year beginning next July 1 would be from \$4 to \$6 billion. This would make an administrative expenditure budget of from \$93 to \$95 billion in place of the President's \$99 billion.

Possible economies suggested by Mr. Stans do not represent an across-the-board percentage cut. Reductions are considered possible for every major item in the budget, however, including even national defense and exploration of our outer space.

While no figures have been given out, it is believed that defense cuts will be sought at a little lower percentage figure than for most of the civilian agencies. For smaller agencies where cuts of less than \$500,000 are considered possible, they are indicated as nominal and no great effort will be made to pare them down.

The space program would definitely be cut back so as to slow down the program and bring it under tighter, more efficient control. The expressed idea is to take the frenzy out of the present crash program. The \$40 billion estimated total cost of putting men on the moon would remain. Whether the mission would be accomplished by 1970 or maybe 1975 isn't considered important.

One of the points Republicans are emphasizing in planning these cuts is that they will not result in an austere budget.

Their idea is to stop budget growth for a few years and stabilize expenditures so that the economy can catch up. If this isn't done, Republicans say the budget won't be balanced for years.

They point out that President Eisenhower submitted an \$81 billion new obligational authority budget for fiscal 1962. President Kennedy's \$108 billion budget for 1964 is a 34-percent increase in 2 years.

"What we need," says one Republican, "is an adding machine on the President's desk so he can keep track of the cost of all the new programs he is asking for."

The Republicans want to stop nonemergency public works and put a moratorium on new projects not essential to security. Government construction—\$7 billion in 1962 is estimated at \$9 billion for 1964 under the Kennedy budget.

Government civilian employment would be cut back by the GOP economy drive, but it is said this will not endanger national security or public welfare. The idea is to cut the planned 500,000 increase of Government personnel from 2.5 to 2.7 million military and 2.3 to 2.6 million civilians by June 30, 1964.

### Cessna's Important Milestone

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER**

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, the Cessna Aircraft Co., of Wichita Kans., last week achieved an important milestone in its history when it delivered its 50,000th airplane. It is appropriate that we recognize the achievements of this aircraft company for it has grown into the world's largest manufacturer of business, pleasure and utility aircraft in the true American tradition of free enterprise.

It was Clyde V. Cessna, a farmer-mechanic from Kansas, who founded this company in 1927. Cessna built his first airplane in 1911 and for the next 16 years barnstormed through the Midwest, making constant modifications on his original aircraft during the off seasons.

From this modest beginning, Cessna has grown to its place of prominence in the American aviation industry. Dwane L. Wallace became president and general manager of the company in 1936. Only one other firm in the Nation has had a total production of more than 50,000 aircraft.

In addition to its prominent role in the private plane market, Cessna has made important contributions to the military posture of our Nation. During World War II the United States and Royal Canadian Air Forces purchased 5,402 twin-engine T-50 Bobcats and 750 gliders were built by Cessna at its Hutchinson, Kans. plant for the Normandy invasion.

The Korean war again brought Cessna into manufacture of military products. Today it continues to serve as a parts subcontractor for several of this Nation's major weapons systems. The company's military division is producing the twin-jet T-37, which is the first airplane in which the U.S. Air Force student pilots receive flight training; the O-1E—L-19E—liaison-observation plane, more than 3,300 of which have been delivered to the U.S. Army since 1950; and the transporter-erector container for the Minuteman missile.

The Cessna story exemplifies the strength of the free enterprise system in America. It is a story of determined and aggressive effort by both management and employees working together. Hard work and perseverance have resulted in Cessna's prominence in the aircraft industry.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following editorial from the Evening Eagle & Beacon published February 25, 1963:

#### CESSNA'S IMPORTANT MILESTONE

Behind the announcement that Cessna Aircraft Co., will deliver its 50,000th airplane today is a story of remarkable achievement over the years by a few men who per-

A1134

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

March 4

sisted with their business dreams even when prospects for success were dim.

In 1931 business conditions were bad, for airplane makers as well as everybody else. Clyde Cessna's company was only 4 years old when it had to close its doors; but through 1931, 1932, and 1933 the pioneer Wichita airplane builder and his son, Eldon, talked stockholders into keeping their plant so it could open again when conditions permitted. For a time gliders were built, along with a few experimental planes.

In the mid-1930's, when Dwane Wallace took over ownership and management, the company began its long, uphill climb. By World War II it was ready to perform in a major way for the U.S. war effort, turning out 5,402 T-50 Bobcat twin-engine trainers for the Army Air Corps.

Again, after war production ceased, the future looked dark. From \$70 million in sales in 1943 (all military), the company's sales fell to \$6 million in 1946. So, the company turned to other products, particularly furniture.

But perseverance and hard work kept the company going when others were giving up, and by 1962 the furniture production could be halted, for military and civilian aircraft production again was picking up. Since then, the climb has been steadily upward, until now Cessna is the world's largest producer of aircraft.

Wichitans salute Cessna and Dwane Wallace and all the stockholders and 5,000-plus employees who have reached an important milestone on this day.

Yet, in so doing, we also realize that it is he who lends honor and stature to the award by becoming its first recipient.

The Hungarian-born, naturalized American citizen ranks among the scientific giants of our time. His aerodynamic theories are fundamental to the air age.

As President Kennedy aptly observed in making the award, there is "no one else who so completely represents all areas involved in this medal—science, engineering, and education."

Authorized by Congress in 1959, up to 20 such medals a year can be granted to bestow national honor for outstanding scientific achievement. We are glad to see this channel for recognition begin to be used.

In selecting the much-honored aerodynamicist as the first medalist, the President has marked the award as one of great distinction. Future medalists, even though they may not have the long-established fame of a Von Karman, will know that the standard of achievement for which they are honored is high.

With this precedent established, the White House now should quickly seek out others deserving of the award whether they already have some formal professional recognition or not.

Vigorous yet tasteful use of the authority to grant a number of medals each year would do much to encourage a high level of American scientific endeavor.

### District of Columbia Schools and Their Prospects

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Saturday edition of the Washington Post editorialized on the condition of the public schools in the District of Columbia. I wish to commend this editorial to the attention of my colleagues, and ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

SHAME! SHAME! SHAME!

Washington now has before it a full, focused picture of its public schools. The picture is presented in Superintendent Carl Hansen's latest report: "Our Schools and Their Prospects." It is a picture which can be looked at only with bitter shame and consternation and dismay.

The report convicts this community of callous neglect of its children. There is not a category in which the schools are not inadequate to the children's needs. The report is prickly with damning statistics. Forty percent of the elementary school buildings in the system are more than half a century old. Three out of four elementary schoolchildren are in buildings taxed beyond their efficient capacity. There are now 2,648 students on double shifts. More than two-thirds of the elementary students are in classes with more than 30 students, 19,566 in classes of 35 or more. A third of the system's teachers are temporary—that is, not fully qualified. Counselors, clerical help, librarians, psychiatrists, special classroom teachers are tragically lacking throughout the system.

If such conditions were disclosed in any self-governing community, the elected school board responsible for them would be

thrown out of office at the next election. But the school board here is not responsible for them. Neither is the superintendent. He has pointed time and time again to the desperate needs of the school system. And the school board has given him support. The District Commissioners, it is fair to say, have done what little they can to help. But the truth is they are all helpless.

The blame for the current situation must be laid at the door of a Congress which refused to let the District of Columbia cope with its own problems and refuses at the same time to deal with those problems effectively. Members of the Congress, largely indifferent to District affairs, have allowed the children of this community to be despoiled and cheated—have allowed the House District Committee to treat these children as pawns in a wicked game designed to prove that desegregation cannot succeed.

The evils, inequities, and inadequacies of the District schools are breeding juvenile delinquency and racial strife and social decay. To discuss local school problems in terms of whether to administer corporal punishment to the victims of these problems is to waste time on an irrelevancy.

The schools are producing troubled children far faster than the rod or whip can subdue them. By withholding from children in desperate need the healing help which modern understanding of childhood could provide, by denying to children from wretchedly deprived homes the kind of teaching that could foster their native gifts, by threatening to crush instead of assuage a rebelliousness the children themselves cannot understand, against conditions they had no share in creating, by offering hostility where only kindness can avail, Washington is generating its own destruction as a community.

The children in Washington's schools are Washington's children. Washington is responsible for them. If they are delinquent, it is the community's delinquency that has helped to make them so. Let us stop trying to punish them for our sins and let us begin instead to demand for them their birthright as Americans.

### William Attwood, Ambassador to Guinea

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the United States is fortunate in having William Attwood as its Ambassador to Guinea. Guinea, part of French-speaking Africa, is a young country. It has had its share of troubles, as any vibrant, new nation does, but it has met those difficulties sensibly and courageously.

The Communists early mounted a drive in Guinea, and for awhile the new government and the forces of moderation in Guinea were in peril. But the Soviets overplayed their hand. Their Communist front runners unmasked themselves and revealed that you don't get Soviet aid without Soviet Communist rule. The Communists underestimated the intelligence of the people of Guinea, and they underestimated the

### Noted Scientist Dr. von Karman Honored

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the President has recently awarded the new U.S. National Science Medal to Theodore von Karman. Dr. von Karman is a great scientist and one of our most useful citizens. His aerodynamic theories have meant much to the progress of aviation and space exploration. He is particularly revered at Arnold Engineering Development Center, which is in the district I have the honor to represent in the Congress, and which is one of the Nation's major aerodynamic research centers. Dr. von Karman has contributed much to scientific research at this important Center of the U.S. Air Force. In fact, the Air Force has designated one of its important test facilities as the Von Karman Test Chamber at Arnold Center in Tennessee.

Mr. Speaker, the Christian Science Monitor in a recent editorial has praised Dr. von Karman for his outstanding work and congratulates him on his receipt of the National Science Medal. I join in congratulating Dr. von Karman and under unanimous consent, I include the editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

VON KARMAN SETS A STANDARD

We congratulate Theodore von Karman on receipt of the U.S. new National Science Medal.